DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 347 950 HE 025 715

AUTHOR Crawford, Beth S.; Kreidle, Ann M.
TITLE Black South Africans in the United States: An Analysis of Their Educational and Practical Training Experiences.
PUB DATE 28 Apr 92
NOTE 47p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Academic Achievement; *Apprenticeships; Black Attitudes; *Black Students; *College Students; Educational Environment; Foreign Students; Higher Education; *Satisfaction; *Student Attitudes
IDENTIFIERS *South Africans

ABSTRACT

A study was done of the experiences of Black South Africans who came to the United States for education and training. The research studied 140 individuals who participated in two programs between 1980 and 1991. Data were collected from the student files and from standard university data from "Profiles of American Colleges" by Barron's Educational Series. The study focused on three outcomes: personal and academic satisfaction and academic achievement. The results indicated that, in general, satisfaction ratings were high with regressional analysis showing that the less satisfied degree candidates included male students, married students, and those at low-cost universities. Undergraduates preferred a rural location and graduate students preferred warm climates. Female undergraduates demonstrated higher levels of academic achievement, while all graduates performed better in cold climates. Results also indicated that for those obtaining practical experience, a good mentor was the most important factor. A qualitative analysis showed that program participants gained self-confidence and maturity . Degree candidates sensed a coldness from Americans and were surprised to find racism in the United States. Those obtaining practical training recount eye-opening experiences as a result of meeting and observing counterparts. They hope to incorporate these innovative teaching techniques or progressive management styles into their work places back home. Included are five tables and seven appendixes with additional information. (11 references) (JB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED347950

Black South Africans in the United States:

An Analysis of their Educational and Practical Training Experiences

Beth S. Crawford and Ann M. Kreidle

April 28, 1992

HE 025 715

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Beth S. Crawford

Ann M. Kreidle

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

SUMMARY

Over one million diverse students study abroad each year. In order to draw conclusions about this population, it is important to study students from individual countries or similar backgrounds. This paper reflects the experiences of 140 black South Africans. Sponsored by the Institute of International Education, the students come to the United States to obtain university degrees or practical training. Student and institution characteristics that affect satisfaction and achievement are analyzed. Common concerns and highlights are noted.

In general, mean satisfaction ratings are quite high. Results of a regression analysis show the following degree candidates less satisfied: male students, married students, and those at low-cost universities. Undergraduates prefer rural locations, and graduate students prefer rural or urban locations in warm climates. Female undergraduates demonstrate higher levels of academic achievement, while all graduates perform better in cold climates. Results of a regression analysis for those obtaining practical experience show that being assigned a good mentor is more important than any other student or university characteristic.

A qualitative analysis shows that participants gain self-confidence and maturity. Degree candidates sense a coldness from Americans and are unpleasantly surprised to encounter racism in the U.S. Those obtaining practical training recount eye-opening experiences as a result of meeting and observing counterparts. They hope to incorporate these innovative teaching techniques or progressive management styles into their work places back home.

INTRODUCTION

Every year over one million students study abroad with over 2.5% of these students studying in the United States (Altbach 1991). These students come here for a variety of reasons. Those from Third World countries, which send the largest number of students abroad, come primarily to improve their work opportunities at home. In particular, technical training is often lacking in these countries or is prohibited for certain population groups. Furthermore there are often poor educational facilities, discrimination against minorities and politically disruptive situations (such as boycotts, strikes, or riots) in these countries.

Nowhere are these conditions more evident than in South Africa. Although South Africa is an industrial nation, the apartheid system excludes the black majority (69% of the population) from full participation in its economic and educational life (Green 1991). This group faces all of the above obstacles in a country that provides high-quality education to whites.

Black South Africans[1] come to the United States for the opportunity of a quality education free of race discrimination and a congenial socio-economic and political situation.

---

[1] In the South African context, this term can refer to people of African or Asian descent as well as people of mixed race.

Although foreign study research has focused on the individual, more needs to be done on the experiences of students from individual countries. As Adelegan and Parks (1985) write, it is difficult to generalize about the foreign student population when students are coming from such diverse countries. Furthermore, little research has been done on foreign study experiences of black South Africans, the focus of this paper.

The Institute of International Education (IIE) administers two programs in the U.S. for black South Africans -- the South African Education Program (SAEP) and the Career Development Fellowship Program (CDFP). The SAEP program awards full scholarships to talented black South Africans to pursue a variety of undergraduate and graduate degrees at United States universities. The program was established to offer an educational opportunity of the highest caliber to disadvantaged South Africans as well as to expose students to an open and democratic society. Participation serves both to enhance the student's self-worth and to nurture leadership potential among black South Africans in hope that they will be better prepared to improve the lives of others in their South African communities.

The CDFP program awards short-term, non-degree fellowships to midcareer, black South African professionals engaged in community service careers. Fellows pursue individually tailored programs combining intensive study and practical experience in their areas

of specialization. The goal of the program is to increase the fellows' effectiveness in their current roles as well as to prepare these individuals better for their roles in a post-apartheid society.

Based on the foreign study literature, discussions with IIE representatives and available student data, we developed the following objectives for this study:

1) To identify student and institution characteristics which affect the satisfaction and achievement of the students.
2) To describe common problems and highlights expressed by the students.
3) To make specific recommendations regarding program policies, based on findings of study.

Methodology

Sample

Between 1980 and 1991, 632 individuals in the SAEP program successfully completed the program by obtaining either an undergraduate or graduate degree from an accredited institution. The results of our analysis reflect the experiences of 100 of these SAEP program participants -- 47 undergraduates and 53 graduates -- during 1985 to 1991. The CDFP program, which began in 1987, is a much smaller program with a total of 138 participants. For this analysis, we selected 40 individuals on which to collect data.

We collected personal data from the sample student files and standard university data from *Profiles of American Colleges* by Barron's Educational Series. Student files are located at IIE for all students who have participated in the SAEP and the CDFP programs. The files contain initial applications, test score reports, debriefing questionnaires and, often, other correspondence regarding issues that arise during the students' stays.

For the SAEP program, a random sample, by choosing every tenth participant in the database, was conducted. If a student's file did not contain the necessary information, it was discarded from the sample and the next person to have complete information was selected. After a complete file was found, the tenth file to follow the original incomplete file would be reviewed.

For the CDFP program, a random sample was conducted choosing every fourth person in the database. The same procedure as above was followed if a file did not contain complete information. Using standard statistical principles, we chose these sample sizes in order to make inferences about the populations.

For the SAEP undergraduate and graduate program we determined three outcomes of interest pertaining to objective one:

1) Personal Satisfaction
2) Academic Satisfaction
3) Academic Achievement

The satisfaction outcomes were measured on a scale from 1 (lowest satisfaction) to 5 (highest satisfaction). Since students were not asked to rate their satisfaction, we assigned values based on information obtained from the debriefing questionnaires, academic progress reports and from other relevant correspondence. If, for example, a student's file contained extensive correspondence related to adjustment problems and wrote primarily on negative issues in the debriefing questionnaire with no positive element to the comments, the student would be assigned a 1 or 2 for personal satisfaction. If the student's comments were overwhelmingly positive, he would be assigned a 4 or 5. The academic achievement outcome was measured by the student's cumulative grade point average (on a scale from 1 to 4) at the U.S. institution as reported on an official transcript.

For the CDFP program one outcome of interest was determined:

- Overall Satisfaction

This was measured on a similar scale of 1 to 5. To assign a rating we evaluated the fellows' debriefing questionnaires, final report questionnaires (completed when back in South Africa), and other relevant correspondence, similar to the manner described above.

Through regression analysis, we tested the effect of the student and university characteristics on satisfaction and achievement for the SAEP program, and on overall satisfaction for the CDFP program.

In order to do a qualitative analysis, we used the questionnaires and other correspondence to collect information on trends in the experiences of the students. Most questions were open-ended which allowed students to express a variety of opinions. After taking extensive notes on each student, we grouped the comments into like clusters -- such as racism experienced or self-confidence gained -- and tallied our results. These comments appear after the quantitative analysis of each program.

SOUTH AFRICAN EDUCATION PROGRAM (SAEP)

Analysis

The student and university characteristics which we collected to perform our analysis of the SAEP program are shown in Table 1. Two-thirds of the 100 students were male and 1/3 female. The average age of the undergraduates at graduation was 28; for the graduates it was 33. Only 8% of the undergraduate students were married, while 45% of the graduate students were married. No funding is provided for married students to bring their families to the United States.

The undergraduates studied mainly non-liberal arts subjects. Only 1/4 declared a liberal arts subject as their major. In contrast, 3/4 of the graduate students majored in liberal arts. Prior education might explain this difference. Many black South Africans are poorly prepared in math and science in high school, and are not encouraged to pursue scientific fields at South African universities.

Table 1
SAEP Program Sample
Student and Institution Characteristics
Percentages and Simple Means

Explanatory Variables	Undergraduates (n=47)	Graduates (n=53)
Student Characteristics:		
% Male	66	70
% Married	9	45
% Liberal Arts Majors	26	72
Mean Age	28	33
Mean SAT/GRE Score	916	1149
U.S. University Characteristics:		
Location		
% in Urban Area	25	32
% in Suburban Area/Small City	28	43
% in Rural Area/Small Town	47	25
% in Cold Climate	83	62
% On Coasts	34	55
Cost		
% Low Cost[1]	36	34
% Moderate[2]	19	34
% High Cost[3]	45	32
Student Population		
Mean Size of University	7,769	16,898
Mean % International Students	5	5
Mean % Non-white Students	26	27
Outcome Variables:		
Mean Personal Satisfaction[4]	3.1	3.2
Mean Academic Satisfaction[4]	3.6	3.7
Mean Academic Achievement	2.8	3.5

[1] Tuition, Room and Board (TRB) ≤ $9,000 per year
[2] TRB between $9,001 and $14,000 per year
[3] TRB > $14,001 per year
[4] On a scale from 1='very dissatisfied' to 5='very satisfied'

Many undergraduate students might view a period of study in the United States as an ideal time to embark upon an academic field that is not readily available to them in South Africa. This

opportunity is especially valuable for those students who wish to enter a technical profession upon their return to South Africa. Obtaining training in a field not available at home is often a motivating factor for study abroad (Altbach, Kelly and Lulat 1985, p.32; Teichler and Steube 1991). The graduate students, however, having already completed their initial university studies at South African universities, are perhaps more likely to continue in liberal arts fields. (Appendix A shows the breakdown of majors in these two categories.)

For the group as a whole, females were less likely to study non-liberal arts than males (34% versus 57%). Female South Africans might have developed the same attitudes that American females have displayed, namely a sense of inferiority in mathematics and a belief that science is less relevant for them than males (Educational Testing Service 1990, p. 37).

The 100 SAEP students attended 81 universities throughout the United States. As Table 1 shows, the undergraduates tended to be at smaller universities in rural areas/small towns, while the graduates were more often located at larger universities in suburban areas/small cities, and on the coasts. The universities were divided into three cost categories for (out-of-state) tuition, room and board: low, moderate and high cost. More undergraduates than graduates studied at the high cost universities. (Appendices B and C show university location and cost breakdowns.)

The satisfaction variables shown in Table 1 depict quite a high level of satisfaction. In general, the students were more satisfied academically (3.65 on a scale with 5 highest) than personally (3.15). For personal satisfaction, 24% of the students received scores of 1 or 2, 39% scored 3, and 37% scored 4 or higher. For academic satisfaction, 11% scored 1 or 2, 24% scored 3, and 65% scored 4 or higher.

The academic achievement of the students -- measured by GPA -- was also quite high. The graduate students maintained a higher GPA on average (3.5) than the undergraduate students (2.8). For the undergraduates, 25% had a GPA between 2.0 and 2.5, 50% had a GPA between 2.6 and 3.0, and 25% had a 3.1 or higher. For the graduates, 50% had a GPA below 3.5 (with 2.9 being the lowest) and 50% had a GPA above 3.6. Graduate schools generally require a minimum average GPA of 3.0 for a student to maintain matriculation, while undergraduate schools generally require a 2.0, which could account for some of this difference.

The average GPA's are quite impressive for students studying for the first time in an American academic environment. Many practices, such as the semester/quarter system, the grading system and test formats are quite unfamiliar to these students. The academic achievement of the SAEP students, however, seems not to have suffered from these potentially detrimental influences.

Hypotheses

We hypothesized that the variables shown in Table 1 would impact the outcomes of interest: academic satisfaction, personal satisfaction and academic achievement. More specifically, we hypothesized that married students would be less satisfied due to the separation from spouses and children, which might also be reflected in their academic achievement. We also believed that GRE and SAT scores would correlate positively with academic achievement, as well as impact on the two satisfaction levels. A student who scores high on these U.S. standardized tests might be better prepared emotionally and academically for a period of study in the U.S. In our final analysis, however, SAT scores were dropped due to the large number of missing scores in our sample.

We hypothesized that several university characteristics would have effects. We believed that students would be more satisfied in suburban areas/small cities or rural areas/small towns rather than urban areas which can often be cold and impersonal. We also believed students would prefer warm climates, coming from mild climates themselves, and prefer being on one of the coasts, where more diverse populations are represented than inland. In addition, we hypothesized that students might be more satisfied and perform better at higher cost, smaller universities, where individual attention and academic resources are more readily available. Finally, we believed that students would prefer universities with larger international and non-white student populations.

We also hypothesized that health status of the students while in the United States and prior international experience would affect our outcomes of interest. These variables were subsequently dropped due to their minimal variation. Only six students had previously lived abroad and seven students experienced significant health problems while in the U.S. However, since health concerns can cause a great deal of stress among international students (Altbach 1991), subsequent studies might want to focus on the health factor in more detail. We also attempted -- unsuccessfully -- to collect information on job status before and after the program.

An additional variable which might be studied in future research is the level of competitiveness among the universities. If, for example, low cost universities are also the least competitive ones, our cost measure might be picking up some variation caused by the omitted competitiveness variable.

By performing regressions analyses for each of the three outcome variables -- personal and academic satisfaction, and academic achievement -- for the undergraduates and graduates, the following results were obtained:

Personal Satisfaction

The results for personal satisfaction are presented in Table 2. (For a complete statistical table see Appendix D.) In general, our model explained much of the variation in personal satisfaction (81%) for the graduate students, but explained less of the variation (37%) for the undergraduates. In other words, additional variables not accounted for in our model affected the personal satisfaction of the undergraduate students. Perhaps degree of homesickness, for example, -- a variable not included in our analysis -- would explain additional variation in satisfaction among undergraduates.

Undergraduates

The only variable significantly impacting on personal satisfaction for the undergraduates was **gender**. Females were on average almost 1 point more satisfied than males (with maximum satisfaction being 5 points). In other words, if a male student had a satisfaction level of 3, a female student -- all else being equal -- would have a satisfaction level of 3.9. Different expectations might have existed between the sexes. Or, the lower satisfaction for males might have been caused by their unfamiliarity with many household tasks, such as cooking and cleaning, which they were expected to perform in the U.S. Marital status, age, degree, university location, cost, size, and student make-up had no significant effects on personal satisfaction for the undergraduates.

Table 2
Impact of Variables on Personal Satisfaction*

Significant Variables	Undergraduates	Graduates
Increase or Decrease in Satisfaction by Variable:		
Student:		
Female	+.9	+.7
Married	--	-1.4
University:		
Suburban/Small City (compared to Rural/Small Town or Urban)	--	-.7
Low Cost Univ. (compared to Moderate Cost or High Cost)	--	-1.5
Cold Climate	--	-1.8
% Non-White	--	-.04
Insignificant Variables for both Undergraduates and Graduates		
Age, Liberal Arts, GRE score, On Coasts, Size of Student Pop., % International Students		
	R Square=.37	R Square=.81

* On a scale from 1 = 'very dissatisfied' to 5 = 'very satisfied'

Graduates

The personal satisfaction levels of the graduates, on the other hand, were significantly affected by a number of variables. Again, **females** were approximately 3/4 of a point more satisfied than males. In addition, **married** students were on average 1.4 points less satisfied than non-married students. This is a substantial difference on a 5-point scale. Married students, separated from their families, face a significant extra burden in adjusting to a foreign environment; a fact which is reflected in their

satisfaction levels. Other studies have obtained similar results. Adelegan and Parks (1985) found in their research on African students that married students studying in the U.S. had greater difficulty adjusting socially than single students.

Considering university location, the graduate students were least satisfied in **suburban areas/small cities**. Their personal satisfaction level in urban areas or in rural locations/small towns was 3/4 point higher. Different needs are probably met in these two preferred locations. In urban areas, students might gain satisfaction from the diversity of people and wide availability of cultural events. The sample graduates did not seem to view cities as cold and impersonal, as we had hypothesized. In rural areas/small towns, students might enjoy the friendly, more concerned atmosphere. In contrast, neither the friendliness nor the easy access to cultural events might be present in suburban locations/small cities, which could lead to the graduates diminished satisfaction.

The graduate students did not enjoy **cold weather**. Those students located in chilly areas were on average almost 2 points less satisfied than the students in warm climates. This outcome supports our hypothesis that students would prefer climates similar to their own. Adjusting to a new climate is a typical problem of transition with which older students often have greater difficulty (Adelegan and Parks 1985). However, since the warm climates are

located in the South and in California, the apparent preference for warm weather could also be interpreted as a more general preference for southern states or California.

The graduate students were less satisfied at the **low cost universities**. Students at moderate cost or high cost universities were on average 1.5 points more satisfied. Services which could affect personal satisfaction, such as international student offices or information centers, are probably less available at low cost universities. In addition, accommodations might be less attractive at these schools. However, students at low-cost universities should be questioned more extensively to determine exactly what is lacking.

Contrary to our hypothesis, the graduate students did not prefer universities with larger **non-white** student populations. As non-white student population went up by 25%, personal satisfaction went down by 1 point. In addition, the percentage of international students at a university had no effect on the satisfaction of the student.

Other variables which did not affect the personal satisfaction of the graduate students were age, major, GRE score, location on coasts, and size of the student population.

Academic Satisfaction

The results for academic satisfaction are presented in Table 3 (and Appendix E). As with personal satisfaction, our model explained more of the variation (72%) in the graduates' academic satisfaction than in the undergraduates' (36%).

Table 3
Academic Satisfaction*

Significant Variables	**Undergraduates**	**Graduates**
Increase or Decrease in Satisfaction by Variable:		
Student:		
Age	--	-.05
GRE Score		-.002
University:		
Urban Location	-1	--
Suburban/Small City (compared to Rural/Small Town)	-1	--
Low Cost Univ. (compared to Moderate Cost or High Cost)	-1	--
Cold Climate	--	-1
On Coasts	--	+.6
Insignificant Variables for both Graduates and Undergraduates		
Gender, Marital Status, Liberal Arts, Size of Student Pop., % International Students, % Non-white		
	R Square=.36	R Square=.72

* On a scale from 1 = 'very dissatisfied' to 5 = 'very satisfied'

Undergraduates

The undergraduates were most satisfied academically at universities in **rural locations/small towns**. At suburban/small city and urban locations the students were on average 1 point less satisfied. In

rural locations/small towns, where few outside distractions exist, academic activities probably take on added importance. Academic support might be more readily available from both students and faculty, which could lead to these higher satisfaction levels.

The undergraduate students were less satisfied academically at the **low cost universities**. They were, on average, 1 point more satisfied at moderate or high cost universities. This lower satisfaction can probably be explained by the relative dearth of resources and services available as well as possibly poorer teaching at low-cost universities, as we had hypothesized.

Graduates

Although the personal satisfaction of graduate students was affected by university cost, their academic satisfaction was not. It is possible, however, that some academic dissatisfaction was picked up by the personal satisfaction score and led to this apparent no-impact outcome. Furthermore, the graduate students apparently strongly disliked the **cold weather**, since even their academic satisfaction went down by 1 point in the harsher climates. They preferred the universities on the **coasts** by over 1/2 point academically. Perhaps universities on the coasts were more attuned to the students' needs.

The **age** of the student had a small, negative impact on academic satisfaction. As age went up by 5 years, academic satisfaction

went down by 1/4 point. **GRE** score also had a small, negative impact. As GRE score went up by 500 points (2400 maximum), academic satisfaction went down by 1 point. Perhaps the older students and the students with high GRE scores had higher academic expectations which were not always realized.

Academic Achievement

Table 4 (and Appendix F) shows the impact of our variables on academic achievement, measured by grade point average on a 4-point scale. Again, the model explained more of the variation (71%) in the graduate students' scores than in the undergraduate students scores (37%).

Undergraduates

Gender was the only variable with a significant impact on the undergraduate students' academic achievement. The academic achievement of females was on average almost 1 point higher than the males'. Their higher personal satisfaction, which was shown earlier, could be a consequence of this higher academic achievement.

All the other variables, including cost of university which did affect academic satisfaction, did not affect the academic achievement of the undergraduate students.

Table 4
Academic Achievement*

Significant Variables	Undergraduates	Graduates
Increase or Decrease in Achievement by Variable:		
Student:		
Female	+.9	--
GRE Score		-.001
University:		
Cold Climate	--	+.5
% Non-white	--	+.014
Insignificant Variables for both Graduates and Undergraduates		
Age, Marital Status, Liberal Arts, University Location (Urban, Suburban/Small City, Rural/Small Town), Cost of University, On Coasts, Size of Student Pop., % International Students		
	R Square=.37	R Square=.71

* On a scale from 1 = 'very dissatisfied' to 5 = 'very satisfied'

Graduates

Surprisingly, the graduate students showed a small negative correlation between **GRE score** and academic achievement. As GRE score went up by 1000 points, academic achievement went down by close to 1 point. Perhaps students with high GRE scores felt a false sense of confidence in their academic abilities at U.S. graduate schools, and did not apply themselves as diligently as other students. **Cold climates** produced one positive impact in addition to their negative effects on the two satisfaction levels. The academic achievement of students located in cold climates was 1/2 point higher than those of students in warm climates. Perhaps the cold weather, which the graduates disliked so much, led them to spend more time studying inside.

Lastly, the percentage of **non-white** students at the universities had a small impact on academic achievement. As the non-white student population went up by 20%, academic achievement went up by 1/4 point. Perhaps greater academic cooperation existed between the students at the schools with higher non-white populations, which led to improved scores for the graduates. However, as mentioned earlier, academic and personal satisfaction were not higher at these schools.

Again, a large number of variables, including gender and university cost, had no impact on academic achievement of the graduates.

Common Problems of SAEP Participants

In addition to the quantitative analysis, we also attempted to capture how students felt about their experience. Often this type of qualitative information cannot be captured in a regression analysis, yet it is very compelling information. Although not all students shared these experiences, we believe that enough shared common experiences to merit their reporting in this paper.

Although students were for the most part satisfied with the SAEP program, many expressed difficulties adjusting culturally and academically. Both graduate and undergraduate students shared these feelings, though often not to the same degree. Here are some of the comments:

* Racism

Even though the United States has, in principle, a quality education system free of overt racial discrimination, almost 1/2 of the undergraduate students and 1/3 of the graduates said they experienced some form of racism. Students said they often felt racial discrimination from professors, other students and townspeople. In a few cases, students experienced discrimination from other blacks. Students also reported shock at seeing U.S. living standards divided along racial lines.

* Cold Americans

Over 1/3 of both the undergraduates and graduates said it was difficult to make friends with American students. In this same regard, students felt Americans were very self-absorbed and kept to themselves. Many students had a difficult time adjusting to the culture; this coldness might have been a cause.

* Disillusionment with American Society

Because most of the students had never traveled outside of Africa, their exposure to Western cultures was very limited. Often, television is the only source of U.S. cultural information for foreigners. Because of the idealized nature of television, many of the students thought the United States would be a paradise. More undergraduates than graduates said that the United States was not as wonderful as they once thought. Several students expressed a stronger appreciation of their own country after experiencing life in the U.S.

* Low Stipend

Comments on low stipends dominated the questionnaires on program attributes. Almost 1/2 of the undergraduates said that the stipend was not sufficient to cover their expenses. Even with a book allowance, many said that buying books often swallowed several months of stipends. Low stipends also kept them from traveling around the U.S. Adequate financing is often cited as the number one need of students (Altbach 1991).

* Poor Quantitative Background

One third of the undergraduates and about 1/2 of the graduates said they were not prepared for math and science classes or computer work. The poor math and science education for blacks in South Africa, mentioned earlier, probably caused these difficulties.

Common Highlights of SAEP Participants

Despite this difficulty adjusting to the customs in the United States and complaints about financial assistance, students made great strides in their personal development:

* Self-confidence and Maturity

Over 1/3 of the undergraduate students mentioned that they became more self-confident as a result of their experience. Given greater opportunities in the U.S., these students were able to fully develop their strengths and skills. As one student said the "...experience removed the thought of being inferior". As might be

expected, fewer graduate students commented on self-confidence. They are older, more mature and presumably gained significant self-confidence f: ›m their university experience in South Africa.

* Other Noteworthy Comments

Students also expressed many of their accomplishments. Students became leaders in campus organizations, campus radio disc jockeys, advisors to other foreign students, organized discussions on South Africa and even had articles published in scholarly journals. Students also learned about other countries from other foreign students. As one student said, "I internationalized my mind".

Several students also expressed their appreciation for the opportunity of an uninterrupted education. In South Africa, the black education system often is disrupted by strikes or riots. In the 1980's the revolutionary leaders called on young blacks to make the townships ungovernable. The slogan "liberation before education" caused students to boycott schools, picket against teachers and generally disrupt the education system (Green 1991). Nomavenda Mathiane, a journalist, wrote about one girl who said she had seven years of learning, five years of disruptions and two years of limbo (Green 1991).

CAREER DEVELOPMENT FELLOWSHIP PROGRAM (CDFP)

Analysis

We conducted a similar statistical and qualitative analysis of the CDFP program participants. Because this type of program is a fairly new model, little research exists. We developed a hypothesis similar to the SAEP program, adjusting for differences in the programs. As in studying the SAEP program, we strived to determine what affected fellows' satisfaction with the program.

Fellows are based at universities but often conduct independent research, attend conferences, gain practical training and meet with other professionals in their field. Course work is only one option. The university does assign a faculty member to serve as a mentor to a fellow. This mentor works extensively with the fellow to develop an appropriate program and provides continual guidance to the fellow. The fellows are asked to rate their mentor using several different criteria, and we did include this **mentor score** in our analysis. Because the CDFP program combines higher education training and practical experience, we focused less on the university characteristics.

Table 5 below provides an overall picture of our sample. In contrast to the SAEP program, gender is more evenly distributed. Forty-three percent are women and 57% men. Of the group, 65% are married with almost twice as many married men as women.

Table 5
CDFP Program Sample
Fellow and Institution Characteristics
Percentages and Simple Means

Explanatory Variables	Fellows (n=40)
Fellow Characteristics	
Mean Age	38
% Female	43
% Male	57
% Married	65
Level of Education	
% Master's Degree	18
% Bachelor's Degree	35
% Less than Bachelor's Degree	48
Length of Stay in U.S. in Months	4
% Paid Leave (22.5% unknown)	58
Mean number of years work experience	12
U.S. University Characteristics	
Location	
% on Coasts	90
% in Urban Area	35
% in Suburban Area/Small City	65
% in Rural Area/Small Town	0
Cost	
Low Cost[1]	33
High Cost[2]	68
Student Population	
Mean Size of University	13,402
Mean % International Students	6
Mean % Non-white Students	30
Mentor Score	
Average	4
Outcome Variable	
Mean Overall Satisfaction[3]	4

[1] Tuition, Room and Board ≤ $9,000 per year
[2] Tuition, Room and Board > $9,000 per year
[3] On a scale from 1 = 'very dissatisfied' to 5 'very satisfied'

About 1/2 of the fellows came to the U.S. with less than an undergraduate degree, but with substantial work experience (12 years on average). More than half (57.5%) reported receiving paid leave for at least a portion of their fellowship. This percentage might be larger, because no data exists on this question for 22.5% of the fellows. Finally, all fellows were located in either a suburban or urban area.

As you can see from the Overall Satisfaction score of 4 (with 5 being the highest), the fellows are very satisfied with the program. Eighty-five percent of the sample had a 4 or higher for overall satisfaction, with only 5% scoring a 1 or 2. Through regression analysis, we determined what contributed to this level of satisfaction.

We speculated that the following would impact on overall satisfaction: gender, length of stay in the United States, marital status, work experience, level of education, obtaining paid leave, mentor rating, university student population, including international and non-white, location of school, and cost of school.

The model successfully explained a high proportion (85%) of the variation in the satisfaction score. Three characteristics significantly affected overall satisfaction, yet with differing degrees of certainty. **Mentor score** had the most certain effect.

For every 1 point increase in the mentor score, the personal satisfaction score went up by almost 1 point ($b=.646$, $p<.01$; see Appendix G). Length of stay and gender also significantly affected satisfaction, but with less certainity ($p<.1$). Females and fellows with longer lengths of stays seemed to be more satisfied. If a larger sample was taken, this significance might become more certain. Unlike the SAEP program, personal or university attributes -- other than the mentor score, length of stay and gender -- did not affect overall satisfaction.

The cost of the university did not affect satisfaction, despite the fact that some fellows did take courses and others relied on university libraries to conduct independent reading and research. At universities in both cost categories, the fellows appeared to be satisfied with the courses they took and the facilities available. It should be stressed though, that most fellows were engaged primarily in practical training and spent little time on campus. (See Appendix C for list of universities by cost, and Appendix B for universities by location.)

Common Problems and Highlights of CDFP Participants

As with the SAEP students, we performed a qualitative analysis in order to report on other comments and concerns expressed by the fellows. This was done by reviewing comments and rankings from the fellows' debriefing questionnaires.

The CDFP fellows were asked to rank eight components of their program according to usefulness. The following four components received the highest rankings, with 1 being highest, and were mentioned most often: "observation of counterparts" (mean score 1.4), "academic courses" (1.8), "independent research" (2), and "meeting with other professionals" (2.1).

* Eye-Opening Experiences

Meeting with other professionals and observing counterparts often led to eye-opening experiences. Over 1/3 of the fellows commented on experiences in the U.S. that caused fundamental changes in their professional attitudes. For example, several education fellows were impressed by the freedom and latitude they observed given to pupils in U.S. high schools. One fellow felt that the resulting closeness between student and teacher allowed students to absorb more information from the teacher. Another was surprised and interested by the practice of hiring social workers and guidance counselors to work with the pupils.

A fellow involved with trade unions was pleased to observe and learn about collective bargaining. He also observed many health and safety regulations in the U.S. that he was determined to implement at his company upon his return to South Africa.

Several fellows commented on the substantially different management styles practiced in the U.S. One fellow was so impressed with U.S.

management practices that she vowed to change her own management style from "rigid bureaucratic" to "situational". She planned to give co-workers more autonomy, responsibility and authority. Another fellow, writing upon his return to South Africa, explained how he now invites input from subordinates as a result of his exposure to the U.S.'s participatory style of management.

One fellow, involved in waste management, was quite affected by the U.S style of friendly persuasion and discussion -- rather than authoritativeness -- to achieve results. As an example, he mentioned the presence of "Thank You" on garbage receptacles in fast food restaurants.

Another was impressed by companies' concerns for children of employees. This fellow planned to organize a pre-school, similar to one he had observed here, for employees' children at his company.

It is clear from the fellows' comments and rankings that simple exposure and observation of American practices can have profound effects.

* Lack of Time

About 1/3 of the fellows commented on lack of time. Many felt that this problem could be at least partially alleviated by improving pre-departure advice. When asked to rank pre-departure advice

given by mentors, over 1/2 gave a score of "very poor". Considering the short stays of these fellows, many felt it was crucial not to waste time in the beginning dealing with logistics that could have been arranged earlier. In addition, since many fellows found academic courses of great importance, they were frustrated at arriving after the beginning of courses or at not being able to complete a full course.

* Low Stipend

About 1/3 of the fellows commented on the inadequate stipend. One fellow felt it was impossible to live in New York City on the allotted stipend. Another was not able to travel as much as he wanted due to monetary restrictions. A third felt that a settling-in allowance could have helped ease financial concerns.

* Other Noteworthy Comments

Overall, the CDFP fellows wrote very positively about their experiences and the program. Many commented on their improved self-esteem and independence. One wrote that the program allowed him to become broad minded, flexible and innovative. Another said he had become more positive and assertive. These characteristics will certainly help the fellows in any endeavor upon their return to South Africa.

Only three fellows mentioned difficulties adjusting to U.S. culture. This is quite a surprising difference with the SAEP

students, who commented overwhelmingly on cultural adjustment problems. Perhaps the shorter time period in the U.S. for CDFP fellows can account for some of this difference. Knowing they will only be in the U.S. for three months, the CDFP fellows might feel less of a need for acculturation and can therefore overlook potentially unsettling American customs. In addition, the CDFP fellows are generally more focused on clear, professional goals, which might leave them less concerned with the cultural aspect of their stay. Also, homesickness is bound not to weigh as heavily on these fellows.

Another important factor which might have eased adjustment is the presence of a mentor. All CDFP fellows are assigned mentors who are specifically available to meet with them, introduce them to colleagues and accommodate them in their stay. Having just one person who shows this interest and concern might make adjusting to a new culture significantly easier.

RECOMMENDATIONS AND CONCLUSIONS

No single type of student, fellow or university location exists that will guarantee an ideal experience in the United States. However, certain steps could be taken that might ease adjustment. Before giving recommendations, however, it should be noted that many of the "negative" experiences mentioned by the students contained a positive element. For example, those who commented on racism and disillusionment with American society generally

continued by saying that they now realize no paradise exists on earth and that South Africa, with all its problems, might not be so bad after all. Those who commented on adjustment difficulties generally continued by saying that they had matured, gained self-confidence, and independence by dealing with these adjustment issues. It is, therefore, not so surprising that practically all students and fellows, no matter how many difficulties they experienced, said that their stays were valuable and that they would do it again.

Following are some recommendations based on the results presented in this paper. Many of the adjustment problems experienced by the SAEP students stemmed from false expectations. They were expecting paradise, but found racism, coldness, homelessness, and indifference. Of course it is difficult to change views that have developed over lifetimes, but certain steps could be taken to make the students at least aware of these problems. During orientation in the United States, the students could be shown documentaries on inner city problems, movies made by young African American directors (such as "Do the Right Thing" or "Boyz 'n the Hood"), and newspaper articles on homelessness and other issues, followed by discussions. The students can then begin to incorporate this other view of the U.S. into their idealized versions.

Another activity that ideally should be incorporated into the SAEP orientation is basic computer training. Perhaps students could be

given access to tutorials in the computer center at the university where orientation is taking place. Gaining even a basic knowledge of word processing or other common programs might lessen the stress that students experience once they are alone at their new universities.

Married SAEP students, assuming funding cannot be found to allow spouses to accompany them, need extra preparation and support. After finding that many volunteers terminated their stays early if a "significant other" had been left behind, the Peace Corps incorporated an additional application requirement for people involved in relationships. An applicant is interviewed extensively on his/her relationship, each partner's feelings and expectations regarding the separation, the other partner's plans, etc. Each partner is then asked to submit an essay answering these same questions. Although this process might seem intrusive, it forces the couple to focus on the separation. Some spouses might decide, as a result of this process, that they are not ready for a prolonged separation. Those married students who do go to the U.S. should be given as much support as possible.

SAEP graduate students should be sufficiently prepared for the hardships of cold weather. They should be encouraged to bring appropriate clothing, or, if possible, be given an extra allowance to buy warm clothing here in the U.S.

Low cost universities should be avoided, if possible. Those who do attend low cost universities should be questioned in more detail regarding the services they are missing. An attempt should be made to provide the additional, needed services -- such as international student advisement -- through IIE. In addition, rural/small town locations should be sought for the undergraduate students.

A few variables never impacted on the outcome measures. The size of the student population and the percentage of international students at the universities never affected the satisfaction measures nor the achievement of the SAEP students. In addition, liberal arts and non-liberal arts majors were equally satisfied and did equally well academically. Therefore, these variables need not be considered in any acceptance or placement decisions. For the CDFP fellows, the most crucial element is to place students with good mentors, regardless of any other university or student characteristics.

As discussed earlier, mentors had a very positive impact on the CDFP fellows. Ideally, the mentor model should be incorporated for the SAEP students, as well. If obtaining mentors for all SAEP students is not realistic, mentors could be provided for those students who might have additional difficulties, such as males, married graduates in cold climates, and undergraduates at low cost universities in suburban or urban areas.

Finally, ideally, the stipends for all students and fellows should be increased. If additional funding does not exist for all, those students and fellows in urban areas might be targeted first. In addition, it might be worthwhile to have a presentation on budgeting during the orientation.

We believe that this study provides a strong foundation on which to continue studying the foreign study experiences of black South Africans. In particular, we recommend analyzing the applicability of U.S. study experiences to South African situations. It is crucial for the full success of programs such as these that students gain knowledge to apply at home. Based on the comments expressed, there is little doubt that a U.S. educational experience for IIE participants is valuable as well as applicable to many situations in South Africa, for example:

> "I feel like a completely new person, confident that I can take my place and contribute to my country."

> "...the opportunity to study in this country has exposed many of us to a system of values and aspirations which transcend considerations of color, and hopefully, we shall return to spread the gospel of truth and racial accommodation."

Yet, it would be valuable to know specifically the aspects of the IIE program that are most beneficial to black South Africans.

As apartheid ends and the demands for an educated black labor force expand, it is essential for black South Africans to prepare themselves. The Institute of International Education and its SAEP and CDFP programs are making a valuable contribution in this process.

Appendix A
Field of Study

Liberal Arts	**Non-Liberal Arts**
Communication	Accounting
Counseling (guidance)	Biology
Economics	Botany
Education	Business
Educational Administration	Chemical Engineering
Educational Psychology	Chemistry
Educational Technology	Computer Science
Educational Teacher Training	Engineering
Geography	Engineering/Civil
History	Engineering/Com
Industrial Psychology	Engineering/Mech
Industrial (Labor) Relations	Geology
Law	Marketing
Library Science	Mathematics
Linguistics	Marketing
Political Science	Medical Technology
Public Administration	Pharmacy
Public Health	Physics
Social Work	Psychology
Special Education	Urban Planning
TESOL	

Appendix B

Universities by Location*

SAEP and CDFP Programs

Urban	Suburban/Small City	Rural/Small Town
U. of Arizona	Alabama A & M	U. of CT
Atlanta University	Bentley	Denison
Bank Street College	Bethel	Emporia State
Boston University	U. of CA (Berkeley)	Grand Valley State
Brown University	U. of CA (Santa Barbara)	Grinnell
U. of CA (Los Angeles)	CA State U. (Fullerton)	IN University of PA
U. of Cincinnati	Central College Iowa	U. of IL (Carbondale)
Columbia University	Claremont	U. of KA
CUNY (Hunter College)	Cornell	Linfield
U. of Delaware	Emory	Luther College
Georgetown University	Hood	U. of MA (Amherst)
Howard University	U. of IL (Edwardsville)	Miami of Ohio
U. of Hawaii (Manoa)	U. of IA	Mississippi
Johns Hopkins	Ithaca	Mount Holyoke
U. of IL (Chicago)	U. of Northern Iowa	Oberlin
Marquette	U. of Miami (FL)	Ohio University
New York Albany	U. of Michigan	Ohio Wesleyan
SUNY College (Buffalo)	Morgan State	Prairie View A&M
New York University	Northwestern	Princeton
Pace	PA State University	St. Paul's College
U. PA	U. of Rochester	Shippenburg
Pomona	Sarah Lawrence	Tuskegee
Pratt Institute	Sojourner Douglass	Utah State
U. of Puget Sound	Stanford	Wartburg
Rutgers (Newark)	Swarthmore	
U. of South Carolina	U. of Toledo	
Spelman	U. of Vermont	
Stevens Institute	Washington and Lee	
Tulane	West Virginia	
Vanderbilt University	Wesleyan	
U. of VA	College of Wooster	
U. of Washington	Xavier	
Wash. U. (St. Louis)	Yale	
Wash. D.C. Gallaudet	Duke	
	Foothill	
	Middlesex Community College	

* As defined by Barron's *Profiles of American Colleges*

Appendix C
Universities by Cost

SAEP Program

Low Cost* ($4,000 to $9,000)	**Moderate Cost*** ($9,001 to $14,000)	**High Cost*** ($14,000+)
Alabama A & M	Atlanta	Bentley
U of Arizona	U. of CA (Berkeley)	Boston University
Bethel	U. of CA (LA)	Claremont
CA State U. (Fullerton)	U. of CA (Santa Barbara)	Columbia
Emporia State	Central College Iowa	Denison
Grand Valley State	U. of Cincinnati	Emory
Howard	U. of Connecticut	Georgetown
U. of Hawaii	U. of Delaware	Grinnell
Indiana U. of PA	U. of IL (Chicago)	Hood
U. of IL (Edwardsville)	Linfield	Ithaca
U. of IL (Carbondale)	Luther College	Johns Hopkins
U of Iowa	U. of MA (Amherst)	U. of FL (Miami)
U. of Kansas	Miami(OH)	Mount Holyoke
U. of Northern Iowa	Marquette	New York University
Mississippi	Pace	Northwestern
New York Albany	PA State	Oberlin
SUNY College (Buffalo)	U. of Puget Sound	Ohio Wesleyan
Morgan State	Spelman	Pomona
Ohio University	U. of VA	Princeton
Prairie View A & M	Wartburg	Sarah Lawrence
Rutgers (Newark)	Washington and Lee	Stanford
Saint Paul's College	Xavier	Steven's Institute
Shippenburg		Swarthmore
U. of South Carolina		Tulane
U. of Toledo		Vanderbilt U.
Tuskegee		U. of Vermont
U. of Washington		Washington U.
West Virginia		Wesleyan
Utah State		College of Wooster

CDFP Program

Low Cost* (≤ $9,000)	**High Cost*** (> $9,000)
Bank Street	Brown University
CUNY (Hunter College)	Cornell University
Foothill College	Duke University
Gallaudet	U. of Michigan
U. of IA	U. of Pennsylvania
Middlesex Community College	Pratt Institute
Rutgers University	Princeton University
Sojourner Douglass College	

* Includes (out-of-state) tuition, room and board

Appendix D

Personal Satisfaction
SAEP Students

Variables	Undergraduates b	Undergraduates t	Graduates b	Graduates t
Student:				
Female (compared to Male)	.890	2.119*	.705	2.845*
Married	-.502	-.620	-1.426	-4.317**
Age	-.125	-1.795	-.016	-.719
Liberal Arts	-.131	-.263	-.051	-.169
GRE Score			-.000	-1.428
University:				
Urban Univ.	.013	.025	-.162	-.426
Suburban/Small City (compared to Rural)	.477	.970	-.726	-2.120*
Low Cost Univ.	-.564	-1.046	-1.543	-4.212**
Moderate Cost Univ. (compared to High Cost)	.686	1.266	-.446	-1.062
Cold Climate	-.426	-.532	-1.818	-4.748**
On Coasts	-.260	-.535	-.512	-1.904
Student Pop.	.000	1.082	.000	.581
% Intern. Students	.024	.387	.024	.549
% Non-White	.000	.017	-.040	-3.367**
*p<.05	R Square=.372		R Square=.807	
**p<.01	F = 1.276		F = 4.778**	

Appendix E

Academic Satisfaction
SAEP Students

Variables	Undergraduates b	Undergraduates t	Graduates b	Graduates t
Student:				
Female (compared to Male)	.259	.686	-.274	-1.116
Married	-.237	-.325	.063	.192
Age	-.014	-.229	-.047	-2.146*
Liberal Arts	-.029	-.065	-.254	-.854
GRE Score			-.002	-3.770**
University:				
Urban Univ.	-.992	-2.143*	.499	1.326
Suburban/Small City (compared to Rural)	-1.003	-2.271*	-.207	-.611
Low Cost Univ.	-1.052	-2.170*	.030	.084
Moderate Cost Univ. (compared to High Cost)	-.735	-1.509	.484	1.165
Cold Climate	-.442	-.614	-.963	-2.541*
On Coasts	-.135	-.307	.638	2.400*
Student Pop.	.000	1.249	-.000	-.880
% Intern. Students	-.023	-.407	.024	.538
% Non-White	-.005	-.398	-.019	-1.604
*p<.05	R Square=.358		R Square=.724	
**p<.01	F = 1.200		F = 3.000*	

Appendix F

Academic Achievement
SAEP Students

Variables	Undergraduates		Graduates	
	b	t	b	t
Student:				
Female	.890	2.119*	-.215	-2.042
(compared to Male)				
Married	-.502	-.620	.223	1.594
Age	-.125	-1.795	.004	.402
Liberal Arts	-.131	-.263	-.021	-.162
GRE Score			-.0008	3.814**
University:				
Urban Univ.	.013	.025	-.066	-.413
Suburban/Small City	.477	.970	.180	1.237
(compared to Rural)				
Low Cost Univ.	-.564	-1.046	.271	1.746
Moderate Cost Univ.	.686	1.266	-.144	-.810
(compared to High Cost)				
Cold Climate	-.426	-.532	.456	2.807*
On Coasts	-.260	-.535	-.088	-.768
Student Pop.	.000	1.082	.000	1.181
% Intern. Students	.024	.387	-.038	-2.029
% Non-White	.000	.017	.014	2.658*
*p<.05	R Square=.372		R Square=.705	
**p<.01	F = 1.276		F = 2.729*	

Appendix G

Overall Student Satisfaction
CDFP Fellows

Variables	b	t
Student:		
Female (compared to Male)	.554	1.84*
Married	.270	.94
Level of Education		
Master's or higher	-.700	-1.57
Bachelor's (compared with less than Bach)	-.303	-1.01
Years of Work Experience	-.020	-0.77
Paid Leave	-.466	-1.10
Length of Stay	.197	1.90*
Mentor Score	.646	2.97**
University Characteristics:		
Urban Location (compared to suburban location)	-.888	-1.73
Low Cost (compared to High Cost)	-.181	.23
Student Population	-.00002	-1.62
Non-white Population	-.029	-1.37
International Population	.040	.83

*p<.1 R Square = .85 F = 4.37**
**p<.01

References

Adelegan, Francis, and David Parks. 1985. "Problems of Transition for Students in an American University." Journal of College Student Personnel 11:504-508.

Altbach, Philip. 1991. "Impact and Adjustment: Foreign Students in Comparative Perspective." Higher Education 21:305-323.

Altbach, P., D. Kelly, and Y. Lulat. 1985. Research on Foreign Students and International Study. New York: Praeger.

Educational Testing Service. 1990. "The Gender Gap." Education Digest 55.7:36-39.

Fasheh, Munir. 1984. "Foreign Students in the United States: An Enduring Experience or a Wasteful One?" Contemporary Educational Psychology 9:313-320.

Green, Max. 1991. " The Politics of Education: South Africa's Lost Generation." The American Enterprise May/June: 12-15.

Hytche, William. 1990. "Historically Black Institutions Forge Linkages of African Nations." Educational Records 71.2:19-21

Jacobs, Walter, Jr. 1991. "The Traditional Role of the SAT in the 1990's." The Journal of College Admission Spring: 21-25.

Lukas, Karen. 1989. "An Analysis of the Academic Performance of International Students in the College of Liberal Arts, University of Minnesota, Twin Cities." Colleges and Universities 65:19-30.

Stiefel, Leanna. 1990. Statistical Analysis for Public and Nonprofit Managers. New York: Praeger.

Teichler, Ulrich, and Wolfgang Steube. 1991. "The Logics of Study Abroad Programmes and Their Impacts." Higher Education 21:325-349.